

II. REPLY UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 11, 13-14, 16, 18, 21, 24, 26, 32-49, 52, 64-67, 69 and 71-72 have been amended, Claims 1-72 are pending in the present application.

A. The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections Over Kenoyer and Washino

Each of amended independent claims 1, 21, and 33 are directed to a method or circuitry that includes at least one of the following features (which are paraphrased merely to facilitate the Examiner's review; and the Examiner is respectfully requested to refer to actual language of the claim amendments recited above in determining whether to grant a Notice of Allowance):

segmenting an image frame of at least one digital image data input stream into multiple segments that each correspond to one of at least two digital image data streams (or first and second image data), and *inserting alignment data* into one or more of the multiple segments, or

providing multiple possible available frame rates for each of at least two digital image data streams (or first and second processed image data) and *adapting a frame rate* of at least one of the at least two digital image data streams (or first and second processed image data) *to one of the multiple possible available frame rates to match the bandwidth characteristics of the analog interface to allow the transmission of a desired amount of image information within the bandwidth of the analog interface.*

Neither Kenoyer or Washino disclose, teach or suggest anything about either of the above-referenced paraphrased limitations. To the contrary, Kenoyer assumes that the frame rates of *each of its digital streams are the same and directly native to the output medium*, and Washino relates to an audio/video production system in which formatting of an image stream is solely based on *type of image format standards (e.g., NTSC, PAL)*, and not *adaptation* of a digital video stream frame rate to transmission characteristics of an *analog transmission interface*. Moreover, Washino merely matches natively timed digital to analog (*i.e.*, identical frame rate) stream outputs. Therefore, each of independent claims 1, 21, and 33 are non-obvious over the cited references for at least these reasons, as are the claims dependent therefrom.

Independent claims 18, 49, 52 each recite (in paraphrased form): *providing multiple possible available frame rates for each of at least two digital image data streams (or first and second processed image data) and adapting a frame rate of at least one of the at least two digital image data streams (or first and second processed image data) to one of the multiple possible available frame rates to match the bandwidth characteristics of the analog interface to allow the transmission of a desired amount of image information within the bandwidth of the analog interface*. Thus, independent claims 18, 49, 52 (and the claims dependent therefrom) are nonobvious over the cited references for reasons similar to those given above.

Independent claims 69 and 71 are directed to a method or circuitry that includes at least one of the following paraphrased limitations:

segmenting an image frame of at least one digital image data input stream into multiple segments that each correspond to one of at least two digital image data streams, and *inserting alignment data* into one or more of the multiple segments, or

providing multiple possible available frame rates for each of said at least two digital image data streams, and *varying a frame rate of at least one of said at least two digital image data streams relative to the frame rate of another of said at least two digital image data streams*.

As with independent claims 1, 21, and 33, neither Kenoyer or Washino disclose, teach or suggest anything about segmenting an image frame and inserting alignment data in the manner recited by these independent claims. Nor do either Kenoyer or Washino disclose, teach or suggest anything about *varying frame rates of at least one digital image data stream relative to the frame rate of another digital image data stream that are then merged into a common digital image data output stream*. Therefore, each of independent claims 69 and 71 are non-obvious over the cited references for at least these reasons, as are the claims dependent therefrom.

Favorable reconsideration is requested.

B. The Dependent Claims

Applicants note also that the dependent claims include additional limitations that render these claims even further novel and nonobvious over the cited references.

For example, dependent claim 3 recites (with emphasis added) “wherein one of said at least two digital image data streams is created to comprise a first image having a

first resolution and a first frame rate; wherein another of said at least two digital image data streams is created to comprise a second image having a second resolution and a second frame rate; wherein said first resolution is higher than said second resolution, and said first frame rate is lower than said second frame rate; and wherein said method further comprises *selecting said first and second frame rates so that said first image and said second image are transmitted simultaneously together across said analog interface as said analog output image stream without exceeding the maximum frame transmission rate capacity of said interface.*” No teaching or suggestion is found for this limitation in either of Kenoyer or Washino. Similar reasoning applies to dependent claim 39.

As another example, dependent claim 14 recites (with emphasis added) “wherein said analog interface is *a video analog transmission interface having a limited transmission capacity that is insufficient to transmit said digital information of said digital image data input stream*, and wherein said method further comprises *reducing the frame rate of at least one of said at least two digital image data streams below native frame rate to allow the transmission of said analog output image stream across said analog interface.*” No teaching or suggestion is found for this limitation in either of Kenoyer or Washino. Similar reasoning applies to dependent claim 45.

For at least the above additional reasons, pending dependent claims 3, 14, 39, and 45 are even further nonobvious over the cited references.

Favorable reconsideration is requested.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and Notice of Allowance are courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the phone number indicated below with any questions or comments, or to otherwise facilitate expeditious and compact prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

/jet50352/

Jonathan E. Thomas
Reg. No. 50,352
Attorney for Applicant

General Electric Company
Global Patent Operation
187 Danbury Road
Wilton, CT 06811
T: (203) 761-1958
F: (203) 761-1924

Wes Enders
Reg. No. 41,735
O'Keefe, Egan, Peterman & Enders, LLP